

## REMARKS

Claims 26-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Cooper.

Independent claim 26 calls for identifying information about the source of a voice message, selecting a portion of the voice message, converting the portion of the voice message to text, exporting the portion and the source information into a graphical user interface that displays a log of telephone calls including the source information and information about the subject matter of the voice message, and displaying the portion in the graphical user interface including displaying the source of the voice message and using the portion to indicate information about the subject matter of the voice message.

Kanevsky does not teach a log of telephone calls. *See* Office action, page 3. Kanevsky also fails to clearly disclose displaying a log with information about the *subject matter* of the voice message together with source information.

For example, Kanevsky's display, which is shown in Figure 2, includes a field 201C, a READ MESSAGE field. *See* column 7, lines 11-22. As shown, there is nothing in field 201C regarding information about the subject matter of a voice message. *See* Figure 2. In fact, a user must click on the READ MESSAGE field to obtain the whole message. *Id.* Because the user in Kanevsky cannot ascertain the subject matter of the message without accessing the complete message, Kanevsky does not disclose a log that includes information about the *subject matter* of a voice message alone, without having to access the complete message.

Also, Kanevsky fails to specifically disclose that the displayed message (*i.e.*, after mouse-clicking on the READ MESSAGE field) is displayed as part of the interface shown in Figure 2. In other words, the complete message left by the caller could replace the screen shown in Figure 2 when the READ MESSAGE field is mouse-clicked on. In this instance, source information would not necessarily be displayed with the complete message. But, because Kanevsky is silent regarding what is displayed along with the

complete message, if any thing, Kanevsky does not clearly disclose displaying source information *together with* information about the subject matter of the voice message.

Cooper does not cure the deficiencies of Kanevsky. For example, Cooper fails to disclose a log that includes the subject matter of a voice message. *See* Figure 4; column 9, lines 54-56. That is, in Figure 4 of Cooper subject information is not available for voice messages. In fact, Cooper expressly excludes subject information with respect to voicemail. *Id.* Taken together, neither reference discloses a graphical user interface that displays a log of telephone calls including the source information and information about the *subject matter* of the voice message.

Also, as described by the examiner, Kanevsky's portion of a voicemail is not used to indicate information about the subject matter of the voice message. For example, the examiner relies on Kanevsky's telephone number or a name as disclosing selecting a portion of a voicemail message. *See* Office action, page 2; Kanevsky, column 4, lines 47-51; column 6, lines 17-30. But, telephone numbers and names alone do not indicate information about the subject matter of a voice message. By this analysis alone Kanevsky fails to disclose a selected *portion* of a voice message that indicates the subject matter of the voice message. Also, as explained above, Kanevsky's READ MESSAGE field does not indicate what the subject matter of a voice message is. That is, a user does not know what a voice message is about unless the user clicks on Kanevsky's READ MESSAGE field. A complete voice message is clearly not a portion, much less a portion used to indicate information about the subject matter of the message.


Thus, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Kanevsky or Cooper, alone or in combination, that a portion of a voice mail message is displayed and the portion is used to indicate information about the subject matter of the voice message. For at least these reasons, the examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 26 and claims dependent thereon.

Under a similar analysis, the examiner has not established *prima facie* obviousness with respect to independent claims 32 and 37, and respective dependent claims.

In view of the remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0154US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 16, 2004



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906